DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 397 013 SP 036 725

AUTHOR Golez, Felipe Victor
TITLE Shifting the Paradigm in Preservice Teacher Education. Modeling Democracy in a Collaborative Site-based Program.
PUB DATE Apr 96
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, April 8-12, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; Classroom Communication; *Classroom Techniques; *Democracy; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Models; Outcomes of Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; Student Teachers; Teacher Student Relationship; Teaching Methods; *Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Paradigm Shifts

ABSTRACT

A reform-oriented teacher education model and its effect on the eventual classroom practice of preservice program graduates is examined. An ethnographic description is provided of the program, which emphasized an experiential philosophical base that permeated both the program and the compulsory educational milieu of the training site. Research consisted of three tiers: (1) a preliminary re-analysis of qualitative evaluation data; (2) interviews with graduates concerning their perceptions of their experiences and how these experiences impacted their first year's practice; and (3) an examination of data pertaining to possible implications for improving teacher education for students from diverse cultural backgrounds. Preliminary analysis of program evaluation data revealed that preservice teachers regularly employed learner-centered instructional strategies in their own practice teaching. Later interviews found use of democratic pedagogy to be integrated into these subjects' classroom practice a year later. Distinctive traits of this program contributing to these outcomes included: a site-based learning context combined with a calculated shift from a social behaviorist to a pragmatic approach toward curriculum and instruction methods; a common philosophical base shared by the university and public school sites; and simultaneous teacher socialization and methods training. (Contains 53 references.) (Author/PB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 397 013

Shifting the Paradigm in Preservice Teacher Education.
Modeling Democracy in a Collaborative Site-based Program

Felipe Victor Golez

The University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. Golez

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Prepared for Presentation at the Annual Meeting:

American Educational Research Association

New York, New York, April 1996

3

SP036725

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Shifting the Paradigm in Preservice Teacher Education
Modeling Democracy in a Collaborative Site-based Program

Abstract

This research provides an understanding of the complex frame factors surrounding the process of negotiating a shared control in a preservice teacher education program. A reform oriented teacher education model and its effect on the eventual classroom practice of preservice program graduates is examined. The study resulted in the construction of an ethnographic description of a teacher education program which emphasized an experiential philosophical base that permeated both the program and the compulsory educational milieu of the training site. The transformative effects of this progressive teacher education model on eventual classroom practice are explored.

This research questions the dominant paradigm of education through an exploration of a structural shift of pedagogical control in a teacher education program. The role that teachers and institutions play in providing democratic instructional and curriculum "choices" is investigated. The research questions for this examination were: a) What happens when a paradigm shift takes place in a school-based preservice teacher education program? b) If shared control is modeled in a teacher education program's pedagogical approach, will it impact program graduates' future practice? and c) Does the program have implications for transforming the schooling process for traditionally disenfranchised learners?

The research methodology was multi-tiered. First, a preliminary re-analysis of qualitative evaluation data was conducted. Second, a dialogical component focused on the program graduates' perceptions of the first tier analysis, as well as the role of the focal teacher education program in shaping their first year's teaching practice. This was done through interviews conducted a year after the program's completion. A theoretical examination of the connections between the research findings and issues of equity for diverse student populations was conducted.

Experiential instructional practices were modeled and methods curriculum was developed through a negotiated process which formally involved; cooperating teachers, university personnel, and preservice teachers. Preliminary analysis of the program evaluation data revealed that preservice teachers regularly employed learner centered instructional strategies in their own practice teaching. The later interviews indicated that the use of democratic practice was integrated into the eventual classroom practice of the program graduates, a year later. The complexity of teaching, a participant's personal narrative, and the influence of contextual conditions affected the degree of a program graduate's eventual pedagogical positionality.

Contrary to other research findings the graduates of this democratic/pragmatic teacher education process often resisted socialization and valued their teacher education experiences.

Unique factors embedded within this study are: a) a site-based learning context combined with a calculated shift from a social behaviorist to a pragmatic approach toward curriculum and instructional methods; b) the university and school site collaboration shared a common philosophical base; c) the teacher socialization and methods training process took place simultaneously. This study contradicts the negative designation generally assigned preservice teacher education programs and establishes the possibility for a transformative teacher preparation process.

Shifting the Paradigm in Preservice Teacher Education
Modeling Democracy in a Collaborative Site-based Program

Introduction

My primary research intention was to provide a basis for an understanding of the complex contextual "frame factors" (Lundgren, 1972) surrounding the process of negotiating a paradigmatic shift in a preservice teacher education program. I examined the diverse ways in which preservice teachers learned to teach in a site-based collaborative program. At issue was the impact of a shift toward shared and negotiated pedagogical control on the eventual classroom practice of preservice teachers. The focal program was grounded in a context which advanced an experiential approach toward curriculum and instruction. This mutual philosophy threaded through the "milieu" (Schubert, 1986) of a compulsory educational setting.

During an academic year, I worked as a qualitative evaluation researcher examining a site-based elementary/middle school teacher education program collaboratively run by a major southwestern university and an adjacent public school district. A major program goal was to create a teacher education experience which negotiated control of the curriculum and instructional process. The program's philosophy was grounded in the Coalition of Essential School's Nine Common Principles for effective schooling and reform. The research site was a Re: Learning elementary school in the process of formulating internal change based on coalition principles. Simultaneously, I was actively participating as a clinical supervisor. I collected data, documenting the academic year, consisting of: fieldnotes, video recordings, scripted teacher observations, survey instruments, and self-account data (journals, reflections, logs).

Preliminary data analysis revealed that preservice teachers (interns) began to regularly employ experiential (learner-centered) instructional strategies in their practice teaching. A pedagogy which included the learner's input was actively modeled in the preservice methods and practicum program components. Cooperating teachers, university personnel, and preservice teachers played a formal role in this negotiated process. This study is an examination of a context driven paradigmatic shift from a social behaviorist (traditional) positioning to a pragmatic (progressive) model.

Shifting control to provide a shared, rather than a dictated, curriculum and instructional experience is a factor that suggested possibility for improving conditions of educational equity among previously disenfranchised students. By linking "immediacy" (enhanced closeness) to the educational process, students have exhibited lowered levels of resistant behaviors in classroom settings (Burroughs, Kearney, & Plax, 1989; Mehrabian, 1968). The change process in the focal teacher education program was grounded in a progressive approach. My researcher positionality,

however, resided in a "critical pragmatic" (Stanley, 1992) theoretical perspective, encompassing issues of educational equity, while taking into account the realities of the schooling context .

Background

I began teaching elementary school as a Spanish-bilingual teacher. From the onset I began to notice a peculiar pattern in discipline problems within the school. A large portion of those causing problems were, as one teacher put it, "those Spanish kids." My first "Good Citizen" assembly was revealing, as not one of "those Spanish kids" was a "Good Citizen" despite making up about a third of the school's population. It did not take long to suspect a close relationship between how children complied in the classroom and their academic capital in compulsory educational settings.

Since that first year I have tried to understand what skews the academic performance of an entire ethnic group. Large numbers of the Chicano children whom I encountered in elementary school were in active resistance against established compliance policies. Their names became the infamous focal point of numerous formal and casual school conversations, in which I must honestly admit that I was often an animated participant. I came to understand that most teachers had the success of all the children in their hearts. We were doing the best we could and wanted children to succeed, but were frustrated by exhibitions of resistant behavior. Continually seeking solutions we laid the blame everywhere: society, the culture, the family, the child, and often our own ability. Still, in most classroom situations the academic success pyramid cemented Chicano children at the bottom. The question is complex with seemingly infinite variables, but what began to emerge was that control played a large role.

My experiences in teacher education and training led me to understand that resistance, compliance, and control are paradigmatically related elements. Preservice teachers exhibit a familiar pattern of disempowerment, in their own education, despite their chronological maturity. They often have as little input into what they learn as the rebellious fourth grade "Chicanitos" and "Chicanitas" that I once taught. Their expressions of resistance are more highly developed as survivors of years of compulsory education: cold stares, yawns, sleeping, and hushed inflammatory corridor talk. A relationship emerges between aspects of pedagogical control and eliciting compliance from students. Whether students are ten or thirty-five they often have little formal control over what or how they learn. In addition, those "not" culturally aligned with these dominant academic control mechanisms, be they fourth graders or post baccalaureates, are subjected to negative forms of institutional scrutiny (Bullough, Gitlin, & Goldstein, 1984; McDermott, 1974; Nieto, 1992).

It is not surprising that as levels of resistance are manifested through accented visible behaviors, such as violence, a public outcry to change schools would emerge. What comes into

question is: Can the institution be changed and how should it change? As teachers or teacher educators, one is confronted by pragmatic questions regarding control dynamics in schools. This study is designed to examine issues that surround the dominant paradigm of education and the effects of a structural shift of pedagogical control in a teacher education program. The role that teacher practice and democratic curriculum "choices" play in eliciting affective forms of compliance or resistance behaviors is brought into question. This study examines the process and effects of a paradigmatic shift toward a negotiated control of curriculum and instructional methods. The investigation was guided by the following research questions:

1. What sort of social interaction constructs, patterns, and factors emerge within a program that attempts to negotiate a paradigmatic change in an educational institution? What happens in the process of negotiating change in a teacher education program?

2. Can a paradigmatic shift in "shared" control versus an empirical-analytical, "engineered" control be modeled in a teacher education program and eventually across diverse contextual settings? In other words, will preservice teachers who have been trained in an experiential approach to curriculum and instruction employ similar teaching practices in their future classrooms?

3. Does a paradigmatic shift toward experiential curriculum and instructional methods, modeled and practiced within a teacher education program, have implications for improving conditions of educational equity for non-culturally aligned diverse student populations?

Significance

Teacher education research shows that generally preservice teachers respond to the socialization influences of their teaching situations and negate the theoretical influences of their teacher education experiences (Britzman, 1991; Schempp, Sparkes & Templin 1993; White, 1989). Unique factors embedded within this study include a site-based learning context combined with a calculated shift from a social behaviorist to a pragmatic approach in curriculum and instructional methods. The collaboration between the university and the school site is located within a common philosophical base, the Nine Common Principles of the Coalition of Essential Schools. In addition, the teacher socialization and methods training process takes place simultaneously within these contextual frame factors.

This research questions the paradigmatic and pedagogical systems dominating education through an implementation of a negotiated/shared rather than a traditional/controlled epistemology. The implications for such approaches suggest an inclusion of previously un-heard participant voices in the educational research process. Research assigns influential roles to the process of teacher induction or socialization in the milieu of the school (Schermpf et al., 1993). A unique difference in the focal program was the modeling of shared curriculum input in a negotiated process versus applying instructional strategies to achieve change. A program quality that was evident throughout the yearlong project was a common theoretical base shared by the university personnel as well as the cooperating site-based teachers. The following preservice teacher reflection, exhibits how a participant' s feeling of comfort with the program philosophy integrated with her own strong feelings toward teaching practice.

> Preservice teacher reflection.
>
> I feel comfortable because I know I am not alone as I enter the world of teaching carrying with me an intense need to save our future. This program wants to do it too. It used to be that only a few were "at risk" students, but it has come to my acute awareness that all students are "at-risk" now. Now more than ever we need to work with the young. The "student as worker" tenet of the Re: Learning constitution can help make it happen. The student becomes actively involved in learning. He explores, discovers, sees opposing viewpoints, participates in hands-on experiences, creates his own projects and conclusions. He doesn't always sit and listen to the teacher, the knower-of-all who daily stands at the front of the class and just lectures and lectures. (Reflection, rp-23)

The implications of sharing instructional control with diverse student populations in public schools was linked to instructional communication research on "immediate" (closeness enhancing) teaching practice and its relationship to resistance/compliance behaviors in classrooms. This theoretical linkage suggests that immediate teaching practices, if employed, will often reduce "cultural conflict" (resistance behaviors) in classroom situations with cross-cultural "communication code differences" (McDermott, 1974). In addition, the impact of individual preservice teachers' personal narratives on their own education, and its relationship to curriculum and instructional practice selection, in working class schools, is investigated. The theoretical link between the choice of pedagogical control mechanisms and the reduction of cultural communication code differences (McDermott, 1974) implicates epistemological and philosophical meaning beyond the parameters of this teacher education program.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dominant Educational Paradigm

In a synoptic, mainstream text William Schubert (1986) identified the dominant educational paradigm as an empirical-analytical, post-Sputnik tradition. This tradition was boistered by the nationalistic parity concerns of a cold war. Schubert describes the educational ambiance of the post-war 1950's as one that urged the dominant educational paradigm toward a more scientific-methodological approach. The majority of pedagogy and policy in compulsory education was directed by a "social behaviorist," expert controlled perspective. The social behaviorist agenda emphasizes a content-driven curriculum engineered by stimulus-response instructional practices such as behavioral objectives (Skinner, 1953; Thorndike, 1903). This foundational structure rests on the concept of scientifically appropriating methodologies for delivering knowledge to students. Teacher education, in this paradigm, focuses on training preservice teachers to practice developmentally appropriate behavioral objectives.

Critical voices have consistently questioned this paradigm throughout its tenure. They question: Who is selecting this curriculum to be deposited into students' minds? What curriculum content is being taught (Freire, 1970; Lynch, 1989; Montessori, 1972)? Academic failure becomes the role of those participants whose culture conflicts with the compulsory educational system (Gatto 1992; Golez, 1992; Holt, 1964; Neill, 1960). Culturally mis-aligned individuals, in what McDermott (1972) labeled as "cultural conflict," find other ways to sustain their identity. The driving force to accept and recreate the dominant paradigm can be identified as a variable in the "cultural hegemony" of traditional compulsory education (Apple 1980, Freire, 1970; Giroux, 1988; Gramsci 1971). One of the by-products emerging from non-democratic schooling structures is an obsession with control or maintaining social order at the expense of educational expectations (Gatto, 1992; Katz, 1987, McNeil 1988). This has strong implications for both preservice teachers and their students. Preservice teachers, whose primary concern is often classroom management (Berliner, 1988; Fuller & Bown, 1969), can maintain control by manipulating curricular content and expectations. For the disenfranchised learner this means that academic expectations may be adjusted to elicit, and thus teach, compliance. Anyon (1981) found that the teaching of higher order thinking skills were more likely in upper class schools. Conversely working class school curriculums were "restricted to procedures and steps," where "physical" control was a priority (Anyon, 1981).

A majority of novice teachers are learning to teach on the job (Kagan, 1992; White, 1989). The control practices of a school are taught to new (novice) teachers (Britzman 1991; Schempp, Sparkes, & Templin, 1992; White 1989). Integrated into this transmission of compulsory educational culture are the "hidden," "null," and "overt" curriculum (Eisner, 1979; Jackson, 1968; McNeil, 1988). These embedded curriculum choices dictate: (a) What is taught (hidden), (b) what is left out (null), and (c) what is given value (overt). These curriculum choices

have the implicit ability to assign students' value according to alignment to the dominant schooling culture (Heath, 1982; Ogbu, 1983; Rist, 1971). Preservice and novice teachers are often encouraged to connect academic ability to perceived student attitude (Weiner & Kukla, 1970 as cited in: Clarridge & Berliner 1991). Thus students who are perceived as successful either are culturally aligned to the dominant curriculum, or at least compliant (McDermott, 1972).

Shifting the Dominant Paradigm in Teacher Education

The majority of teacher education programs carry an agenda that encourages a transformation in preservice teachers (Kagan, 1992). Preservice teachers, however, enter with a predetermined picture of what it means to teach (Britzman, 1991). These are eventually integrated into their socialization process (Schempp, Sparkes, & Templin, 1993; White, 1989). Teacher education literature suggests that teacher training programs have very little impact on the eventual classroom practice of preservice teachers (Kagan, 1992; Su, 1992). In data collected through interviews and surveys, Su (1992) found that the student teaching experience was a weak influence in the teacher socialization process, with university course work exhibiting an even lesser impact. A reason for this is suggested by Eisenhart:

> It does not appear that a teacher education program can mandate some other needs just because the program proponents think them appropriate or sophisticated, make no other structural changes, and then expect the student teachers to "see" the wisdom of the alternatives (1991).

Very often teacher education programs preach methods while practicing others. This fuels a negative teacher perception of teacher education which Fuller & Bown (1975) described twenty years ago: "Teacher education is not speaking to teachers where they are. Feelings of anger and frustration about teacher education are typical among teachers." Such structural change is historically met with considerable resistance because of the entrenched pervasive organizational structure of education (Cuban, 1993; Katz, 1987; Sizer, 1984).

> Once in place, standardized structures serve many functions, many of them having nothing to do with learning . . . Most people dislike change . . .The existing hierarchies are comfortable for the people at the top of the school bureaucracy and for their influential colleagues in the universities with whom they are interlocked in a variety of training-to-license programs. (Sizer, p. 210)

Connecting a Paradigm Shift to the Education of Culturally Diverse Learners

How does the inclusion of the preservice teacher's voice in their own learning impact the education of diverse learners? McNeely and Meertz's (1992) state that most teacher education programs "operate **as if** all students either come with no pre-existing constructs or with one, shared, infinitely malleable one (p. 11)." As surviving products of a traditional educational model most preservice teachers rarely experience a learner-centered curriculum. Their learning experiences have not been a shared or a negotiated process. Most preservice teachers enter the profession with a preconceived notion of teaching based in a traditonal educational narrative that is eventually supplemented by a constrained teacher socialization process. Teacher education research shows that generally preservice teachers respond to the socialization influences of their teaching situations and negate the theoretical influences of their teacher education experiences (Britzman, 1991; Schempp, Sparkes & Templin 1993; White, 1989).

The context of this teacher education program was within an elementary school in the process of negotiating its own philosophical change. The teacher socialization and methods training took place simultaneously within these pragmatic contextual frame factors. The collaboration between the university and the school site was melded within a common philosophical base. This study puts forth the theoretical hypothesis that a shifting in the instructional control paradigm within teacher education has the possibility of impacting the education of a culturally diverse student population. A connection is drawn between immediate (close to student) teaching practices and a reduction of "cultural conflict" and "cross-cultural communication code differences" (McDermott, 1974). In order to be a change agent in compulsory education, teacher education programs must model and contextually support the pedagogy that they proselytize.

Methodology

Design of Study

The research project had a qualitative design with three parts or tiers. The first tier was a reconstructive thematic analysis of data gathered for program evaluation purposes in a site-based teacher education program. This tier delved into an understanding of what occurred in the social and contextual experience of preservice (student) teachers who were encouraged to participate in the process of developing their own curriculum and instruction. The second tier was a longitudinal component with triangulation purposes. The third tier was theoretical, examining the emancipatory implications for a paradigmatic shift in a teacher education program.

Five Stages of Critical Qualitative Research

For the purpose of having a linear heuristic methodological instrument, I used Apple and Carspecken's (1992) Five Stages of Critical Qualitative Research. In addition, because of the original monological evaluatory quality of the data collection in the first research tier, I incorporated methods outlined by Michael Patton in Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods (1990). The first three stages of the Critical Qualitative Approach involve data collection and preliminary analysis. In the last two stages the data is analyzed and explained. I chose this framework for the following reasons: (a) The first three stages facilitate dealing with the data I initially gathered; and (b) the last two stages serve to accentuate my theoretical positionality with regard to education and research .

Tier One-Initial Data Collection/Preliminary Analysis

Tier one involved gathering the primary data or primary record that supported the qualitative study. This consisted of standard naturalistic ethnographic approaches such as participant observation. In this first research tier there were four primary data sources that I examined and collected: fieldnotes, practice teaching scripting, video recordings and self-report instruments (reflections, survey responses). These data were generated threefold, by myself in a program researcher role, other program personnel, and the participants themselves. The data were originally gathered for evaluation purposes to describe the methods and practices in a site based teacher education program. A preliminary analysis of the collected data was conducted. This process consisted of a re-analysis of program evaluation data for purposes of informing this specific study. Constructs emerged that suggested a paradigmatic change in curriculum and instructional control. The purpose of this preliminary analysis was to inductively coerce emerging meaningful patterns that could be further examined in the second research tier.

Tier Two-Longitudinal Data Collection

In this component initial categorical structures were created from construct patterns emerging from the preliminary reconstructive analysis. Interview questions were developed from the reconstructive analysis of first tier data. Numerous questions focused on issues of control emerging from the analysis. Participants were asked to evaluate the preliminary findings and substantiate data interpretations. In addition, participants were asked to reflect on their first year teaching experiences in relation to the preliminary data. The data gathered from these dialogical interactions was then analyzed.

An important facet of the interview process was to establish whether the paradigmatic changes in the program affected the preservice teachers' current classroom practice with regard to curriculum and instructional control. The purpose of this line of questioning was to inform an

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

initial researcher hypothesis that a modeling of paradigmatic change in methods, curriculum, and instructional control might influence future teacher practice. The research question embedded here was whether preservice teachers who had been trained in a pragmatic paradigm would exhibit this modeled strategy in their own future practice. This tier's findings revealed that program graduates held the program in high esteem and often felt changed by their teacher preparation experience. The use of modeled pragmatic practices, however, were interwoven with numerous complexities.

The data gathered from this component was analyzed for purposes of determining if there were significant relationships emerging from the experiences of participation in a paradigmatically different teacher education program. Of particular interest was how participants formulated their curriculum choices. Another focal interest was whether similarities emerged in comparative sites. Preliminary implications were dialogically examined with participants to both provide triangulation and to encourage the voices of participants in research interpretations.

Tier Three-Impact on Educational Equity

This stage was an examination of the relationship between research findings and general social systems. In this tier the data was examined for implications regarding improvement of education for students from diverse cultural backgrounds. This tier responded to a theoretical researcher hypothesis which connected the focal program to the improvement of educational conditions for those whose cultural communicative codes are not synchronous with those of the traditional educational paradigm.

Data Collection

Participant Observation

As an adjunct clinical supervisor I was immediately granted access to a wide variety of data collection opportunities. I conducted classroom observations of preservice teacher's practice teaching, collecting scripting (evaluatory fieldnotes) as a part of the clinical supervision cycle (Acheson & Gall, 1987; Crisci, March, & Peters, 1991). I read and reacted to self-reporting reflective journals of preservice teachers. I video-taped teaching experiences and semester portfolio presentations of the participants. In essence, I was quickly immersed into a participatory research role linked to the education and training of my focal participants. This put me into a position where I could not maintain an etic view. I had an applied research interest to influence the program's success in teaching preservice teachers to teach.

Self-Report Data

Self-report data in this study consisted of two types. The first were the self-reflection journals of preservice teachers formulated during the program. What is interesting to note is that the reflections gradually took on different forms, beyond the written. One student, for instance, produced a rap song to express her reflections, while another interviewed 4th and 5th grade students on their opinion of portfolio assessment. The second self-report data source consisted of the final survey responses of preservice teachers upon completion of the program. This data source contributed to the inquiry focus for the post program interviews.

Interviews

Interviewing served as one of my major sources of data collection. The interview questions emerged from a reconstructive analysis of qualitative evaluation data gathered during the program. The questions took on a more focused quality as the interviews proceeded, subjected to a form of constant comparative analysis (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993; Strauss, 1987). Interviews took place after the participants had completed a year of teaching examining the longitudinal effects of the program. The interviews also provided a triangulated credibility check of the researcher's preliminary data analysis. The interview settings were often the participants' after-school classrooms; several interviews, however, took place in diverse settings such as: a campus office, a participant's residence, and a McDonald's restaurant.

Setting and Participants

The teacher preparation program was situated within the R: Tijeras Elementary School, which serves a rural, southwestern community, administered by a larger urban school district. There had been a university presence at the site-based location for over two years. The focal year was the first time that the teacher education component had resided in the school for the entire year. Previously the program had been a post baccalaureate student teaching model. The setting for interviews were negotiated to accommodate the needs of participants and the researcher. There were 13 focal participant-graduates of the site-based collaborative teacher education program, who spent a year in the school-based training project. Two of the participants were not interviewed.

Data Analysis

How to make sense out of the mountains of program data gathered during the year-long program was at first overwhelming. The actual coding system for the analysis of the data came about through a group effort by myself, Dr. Mead (university program coordinator), and Marilyn (site-based clinical supervisor). We met together for purposes of organizing the data for

presentation and developing an evaluatory report. We also had come together with three different approaches regarding how to organize the data. In the end we collaborated to create a combination coding system. We began to see that the year had played out thematically, adhering to the essential question framework. Thus, evaluation reports could be constructed around the program's structural perennial questions. After this initial analysis it became clear that much of the program data occurred in thematic chunks. Discussion did not occur in fragmented segments, but rather in a flowing patterns usually conforming to a discursive theme. Guiding weekly seminar questions, resulted in thematic discourse, which facilitated the isolation of constructs and significant patterns.

In the "analytic induction" (LeCompte and Preissle, 1993, p. 255-257) of fieldnote data there emerged recurring categories or patterns across the primary and secondary data sources (shown in Table 1, below). Many of the categories or construct patterns that emerged in the initial evaluation research analysis, continued to express meaning in the reanalysis of the data. Thus the secondary triangulation data sources served to add credibility to emergent implications. The end of the year survey for instance was formulated to verify program credibility but results also informed the interview questions. The interview questions reflected a narrowing down or a focusing on "selective" (Strauss, 1987) constructs that emerged in the first research tier. The table below identifies the data sources used in this study and their selection importance. All data was to some extent analyzed through a combination method of "open coding" (Strauss, 1987, p. 29-33) and analytic induction, which entailed a search and identification of robust emerging categories.

Table 1

Data Base by Research Tier

Data Source	Analysis Process	Use and Purpose
Tier One - (Entire Academic Year) *		
Fieldnotes	open coding analytic induction	primary source of categories
Video tapes	open coding	secondary source for triangulation
Reflections	selective coding	secondary source for triangulation
Surveys	selective coding	secondary source for triangulation

(table continues)

Table 1 *(continued)*

Data Source	Analysis Process	Use and Purpose
Tier Two (After first year of teaching)		
Interviews	selective coding	primary source of longitudinal categories

*Note. Fieldnotes were weekly, video tapes-24 hrs. of special events, reflections-one semester/weekly, survey.

Descriptive Narrative

I became aware of university, site-based, teacher education programs through my participation in an orientation lecture for prospective, preservice teachers. At the orientation I delivered a presentation describing university's largest Block teacher licensure program. I felt I had learned more about educational theory and practice in one year of clinical supervision, than in seven years of teaching and inservice training. The problem, I eventually realized, was that these sentiments of enrichment which permeated the clinical supervision experience often did not transfer into the ranks of future teachers in training. In the orientation meeting, I found it most interesting that the site-based programs were represented by both supervisors and participants. In comparison, the campus-based Block program was described only by supervisors and other experts, such as myself.

Recognizing Democratic"Choice"

Three month later I was recording fieldnotes for my study in a site-based seminar session. I felt it was going to be a long year in a "touchy- feely, disorganized, flaky program." What soon became clear to me was that whatever was going to be taught to the preservice teachers would emerge as the program evolved. Though there were planned instructional events, the program's curriculum emerged from cooperating and preservice teacher seminar discussions. In the Block program the teacher education curriculum and instruction had been laboriously planned by faculty and supervisors. In comparison, this program seemed to have all the components of a disorganized traditional Teacher Education program. It had the specialized agenda of isolated inservice and methods training. My initial evaluation of these training sessions were that they illustrated the throwing of information at teachers, which I had often experienced throughout my

own elementary teaching career. The methods were supplemented by a weekly dose of rambling seminars based on essential questions randomly submitted by the "interns" (preservice teachers).

I failed to recognize the embedded progressive, experiential quality and the undercurrent of democratic"choice" flowing through the program. What began to emerge was that none of the participants, including myself, were accustomed to working in an educational setting which embraced democratic"choice." I had never really seen an experiential model in action. I later found that this was true, to some extent, for all those involved. I knew that something was different regarding the control factor in the program. I questioned, who exactly was in control of the program. As I became more familiar with the program, I came to realize that no one was in control, yet we all were. The following excerpt from interviews, a year after the program's completion, demonstrates the discomfort felt by preservice teachers with having an educational voice or "choice" in constructing their own learning.

> Post program interview.
>
> Felipe: Now did you feel that it [the program] was a little bit different, that you were allowed to have input into you own [learning], not allowed but encouraged . . .
>
> Elaine: Oh yeah, it was different and some students had a hard time with that . . . I mean, you go to college, you get your syllabus, this is what you do, do it this way, 250 words, blah, blah, blah, 6 pages, however and it's due and all of a sudden we're doing [anything] anyway we want. What do you mean anyway we want? (Interviews, E, 3m)

In addition, my roles as a clinical supervisor and seminar facilitator came with unexpected conditions of power and meaning. It took me a while to understand this. I felt, at first, that I wasn't an authority figure. Thus, in the weekly seminars I assumed a role of the interactive researcher, occasionally looking up from my laptop and interjecting a perspective. In one such circumstance I was made aware of the distinction attributed to my position. A discussion had ensued surrounding issues of multicultural education in schools. Having considerable experience and opinions surrounding sociocultural issues in schools, I adamantly interjected. I could, however, feel the tension building especially from the preservice teacher whose opinion was contradicted. Finally, the intern with an opposing opinion asked that I not use his dialogue in my research. Reflecting on this incident I re-evaluated my role as a clinical supervisor/researcher in the preservice teacher seminars. From that point on I often suppressed an inclination to interject for fear of shaping the data.

Reflections

Preservice teachers not only expressed their reflective thoughts in writing, but also through: art, interviews of children, and rap songs. The following written reflection excerpts express a participant awareness, of paradigmatic change, emerging from the program's movement toward a progressive educational experience; note the reference to "democracy" in the second excerpt. The reflection samples also exhibit a positive attitude toward the program's learner-centered pedagogical stance. The last reflection, for instance, highlights the comparative envy of program outsiders as an expression of experience validation.

Preservice teacher written reflections.

The past weeks have flown by rapidly. Recently without realization I found myself laughing, loving and enjoying myself with the kids in the classroom. I thought, all right I am comfortable with these kids! As I have grown more at ease in the classroom, these wonder moments have increased. Much of this ease has occurred because of the tone of the intern [preservice teacher] program. (Reflection, R-9t)

As an intern, I've noticed the R: Tijeras program to be very flexible, very open to ideas. We have weekly meetings where we meet and just "rap" about what's going on, how we feel, what we are/are not doing. We can make suggestions, suggest things to explore that weren't originally in the program. The greatest part is that we were listened to! Democracy at work,a rarity to be sure! (Reflection, R-20m)

Marilyn [clinical supervisor] has figured out that she can implement "student as worker" with us in ways she never did with fifth graders. We have cars. She can let us loose to tap the resources of the community. R: Tijeras interns are showing up in schools from the South Valley to Edgewood. It's fun. People we meet in schools are a bit surprised. "Why aren't you in the Junior Block [campus-based program]?" "You are just observing, you don't have to write papers about it?" And so on until they get it and out comes, "I wish I got to do that." (Reflection, R-9b)

Alternative Assessment

The teacher education program conducted part of its preservice teacher assessment through end of the semester exhibitions. There were also three-way evaluation conferences, as well as numerous observations of classroom practice by clinical supervisors, cooperating teachers, peers, and assorted visitors. Not all preservice teachers completely bought into alternative assessment models, which lead to intense seminar discussions regarding grades as a

motivating influence. There was considerable prior discussion as to what was to be expected, both by the preservice teachers and by evaluatory personnel. It was again evident that neither the preservice teachers nor the supervisory personnel were initially comfortable with such an alternative assessment process. The assignment for the first exhibition was to connect what had been learned in the first semester responding to the essential question: "How can I best facilitate my and my students' learning?" The presentation results went far beyond the expectations of both preservice teachers and supervisory faculty. The following data chronicles the uncertainty experienced by a preservice teacher toward the use of an alternative assessment form.

> Preservice teacher written reflection, first excerpt.
>
> For the most part, my diploma will come as the result of accumulating enough credits in the right courses. Still, the final grade, the grade that will culminate all of [the] long nights, will be an exhibition of this last year's knowledge.
>
> A diploma by exhibition.
>
> The wind increases. I hear the autumn's last leaves rustling signaling their determination to stay the course, too.
>
> I have learned much in the last six weeks. Much about this idea of exhibiting one's knowledge. I have planned two vastly disparate units for forty children of vastly disparate abilities. I have asked them to exhibit their knowledge.
>
> And I have seen many of them, most of them passionately assail their tasks. I have seen them use the skills they have the most faith in. I have seen success where I would have predicted failure.
>
> So while my own children sleep, and the wind and I keep each other's good company. I wonder whether I will perform as well. (Reflection, R-37b)

Socialization, "I'm Late Because the Children Needed Me."

As the year progressed a socialized quality began to emerge in the seminars, assessment exhibitions and preservice teaching practice. The cooperating teacher seminar and the preservice teacher seminar changed. Where earlier there had been moments of silence when I could easily stop typing and interject my perspective, doing this had become very difficult. The seminars took on a graduate student seminar ambiance, and interjection needed to be planned and timed. Soon, this was followed by a pragmatic turn in conversation and the excitement of experiencing change began to plateau. What had been considered a "deepening conversation" took on a "jump through the hoop" quality in the preservice teacher seminar.

Attendance in the seminars was reduced; this was attributed to "needing to be in the classroom." The preservice teachers became focused on completing the program and their

"authentic" concerns became the most practical: licensure process, fulfilling program requirements, and specific details of classroom practice and management. Attending the seminars and posing essential questions began to take a secondary position to the conducting of classroom tasks and future employment concerns. The theoretical quality of the first semester shifted to a pragmatic focus.

Simultaneously, an opinion began to grow among the supervisory personnel and visiting outside observers that the practice exhibited by the preservice teachers had gone beyond anyone's original expectations. During my supervisory observations I was finding less to critique and more to praise. I had other clinical supervision duties at another district school which facilitated making comparisons of teaching effectiveness. It became clear that most of the focal preservice teachers, who had experienced the year long program, were very well prepared to teach. In addition, the cooperating teachers were consistently commenting on the preservice teachers' effectiveness.

Oddly, issues surrounding behavior management began to surface in this same time frame. The preservice teachers seemed to have good, continuously improving classroom control. Most of their lessons were interactive, and their students appeared involved in their own learning. Rarely did I observe clashes of minds and the testing of new teachers that often appear in teacher training situations. Despite this apparent instructional smoothness, the preservice teacher seminars began to abound with questions regarding behavior and disruptive students.

During this same time period, preservice teachers were conducting their solo practice teaching. What was very apparent was the distinctive personalized practices that each preservice teachers employed when conducting a classroom. One preservice teacher kept a very low profile in the room, while another was consistently interjecting. One preservice teacher turned her classroom into a thematic barnyard complete with bales of hay and incubated chickens; while another had a traditional environment with her students self-directing themselves through a daily list of endless tasks. A tension emerged between the middle school and the elementary program components. These conflicting views were often couched in discussions regarding the emphasis of content or process. Preservice teachers began to express and exhibit a haggard tense persona, as the year moved toward completion.

End of the Year Survey

At the end of the year an open-ended program evaluation survey was given to the preservice teachers. From their perspective the preservice teachers, for the most part, expressed a high opinion of the program. It is interesting that there were few dissenting voices repudiating the strength of the R: Tijeras teacher education experience. Critical opinions were expressed regarding the lack of concrete method education components. Some individuals implied a fatigue

with the seminar discussions and debate. The survey itself was criticized as time consuming, taking time away from working with children, and adding more stress to completing the program. Overall a sense of program success emerged from the end of the year survey. The survey questions closely mirrored the program's perennial essential questions and qualitative evaluation coding system. The following typifies the end of the year survey responses casting the program in a positive light. Embedded within the responses one might detect the implication of having a voice in one's own learning process.

End of the year survey.

Question

Do you feel you were taught what a preservice teacher needs to be able to teach? (Survey 1-1)

Responses

Yes, the most important skills as I see them now are: classroom management, curriculum and pedagogy development and implementation, flexibility, social skills with peers, students, parents and administrators. These areas have been most completely met by a combination of observation/modeling and then doing. (Survey, 1-1, d)

I was free to find out things I felt were necessary for me to learn. I chose what age children I wanted to work with and observe because I was able to explore enough to find out where I felt at home. (Survey, 1-1, j)

The year ended with a final exhibition by the preservice teachers. The theme for these exhibitions was "Myself as Teacher." Though these presentations were very good, they seemed anti-climatic, a debriefing exercise compared to the dynamic preceding events of the focal year. I did not see the program graduates again until their interviews a year later.

Preliminary Findings

The preliminary analysis indicated that the program was a success. By the end of the program the preservice teachers exhibited an air of confidence that was reiterated by a variety of sources, most especially the cooperating teachers. I questioned whether it was pure chance that a special group of people had fallen into the same program. How did the personal narratives of preservice teachers affect their integration of program pedagogy?

With regard to the program structure itself, what emerged was that shifting toward a progressive educational agenda had been difficult and extremely complex. The lack of a

predetermined, imposed curriculum was unsettling to both teacher and student. Many aspects of the program were often described to be "one step forward and two steps back." No matter how much we wish for a magic causal treatment learning to teach is a complex affair. After the program's completion, what still remained to be determined was how the program graduates would face the future challenge of first year teaching.

Revisiting the Program After a Year of Teaching

Interview Questions

The interview questions were originally written for the purpose of answering the following primary research questions: (a) Did the program influence the practice of program graduates? and (b) Were my interpretations of what occurred in the focal program valid (e.g. shift in paradigm)? The initial set of interview questions served well as a research instrument with which to begin investigating the program's results. As the interview process progressed a need for new questioning patterns became apparent. I also found that certain topics tended to elicit the greatest response, such as what to do with "children who refuse to learn." In addition, the open ended nature of my interviews often led to an exploration of interesting individual perspectives regarding the program. For instance, I found that most program graduates had encountered job search difficulties and thus found work in a wide variety of settings.

Influencing Future Practice

The key research question was whether the focal teacher education program impacted the practice of its participants. It soon became evident that most of the participants had positive things to say about the R: Tijeras program, in a wide variety of settings. They did, however, have reservations regarding the incorporation of the complete pedagogical package emphasized during the program. The complexities surrounding who they were and where they found employment influenced what aspect of the program was integrated into their current practice. In answer to the question regarding the program's pedagogical influence on a participant's future practice, the following interview excerpt illustrates the complexity exerted by one's setting and narrative.

> Felipe: The first question is . . . whether you are using any of the strategies or practices that you learned in the R: Tijeras program?
>
> Judy: Yes, I used quite a few of them. Teaching last year I tried to . . . I went in to use the cooperative learning that we learned up at R: Tijeras. I started out with . . . students that . . . were not familiar with this at all and they had a great deal of difficulty

with it. So we had to back off and just slowly go into it . . . pretty much all the things we'd learned there [at R: Tijeras] I used.

Felipe: Now when you say you backed off, did you eventually incorporate the "choice" practices and rubrics and all that?

Judy: Yes, . . . we backed off and slowly started working as partners, rather than groups . . . Then after they got comfortable working with partners, then we [began] to perform group work . . . they didn't trust each other to work in a group and so we had to build that trust so you can [work] together and trust each other to do their part . . . Then we started more things or somewhat like contract work with rubrics and stuff. And at first they, they really didn't care for the idea . . . The first project we did they had two weeks to complete it. The first day, they were really complaining and after that they came out with wonderful work . . . they really enjoyed doing it after they started. (Interview, J1)

Most of the participants had a positive opinion of the program. This positive view, however, was consistent with similar findings emerging from research I conducted with other site-based programs without an identified philosophical mission. This raised the question: Was democratic "choice" or paradigmatic shift component essential to influencing practice? Participants, in my other research, considered the most valuable part of their teacher education to be the interacting with "real" children in a "real" school setting. Were the participants aware that they had taken part in a teacher education program undergoing a paradigm shift? This led me to begin using diagrams comparing the traditional teacher education paradigm and the R: Tijeras Teacher Education structure. The following is a sample of the questioning and response exploring this issue:

Felipe: This is a . . . schematic I made of a traditional program . . . from when I worked in it . . . the way it works is that the methods are taught at the university by university personnel . . . [to] preservice teachers, who carry it into the school and . . . then is observed by the university teacher and interactive cooperating teacher . . . so what I am saying is that the R: Tijeras program worked kind of different because the practice with the methods were happening at the same time and everyone sort of had a voice in . . . what kind of methods were going to be taught and the practice itself interacted with the methods . . . you guys [preservice teachers] would come in and say, well . . . we need

more reading . . . I look at it [the R: Tijeras model] as more of a circular of flowing type of teacher education model. It's different than the traditional [model].

Lynda: That's exactly right . . . I didn't feel exactly the same at that time [end of last year] as I do now because I kinda felt like . . . have I really been taught everything that I really need to know? And it's only in using it that I see I was. Which is very different from the university where they teach you reams and you write papers and you think, "I know everything there is to know." Well, my first degree was mostly psychology and I thought, "I know all this" and then I went to work in a counseling center and I went "Oh, no! . . . this is not going to work" . . . theory and practical experience are just very different. So, yes I think that your diagrams are exactly right. We had that ability to go back and I think a lot of the anxiety that we would normally have felt after we got hired as first year teachers we had already dealt with as students. We had already seen where we didn't feel comfortable. And we had been able to go back and say, "yes give us more about this" . . . I think we knew a lot more than . . . first year teachers, you know that have been in different programs. (Interview, L10)

This view of how well the program worked was not unanimous. Some participants felt that the program did not work exactly as I had described, and that it did not respond to the needs of all persons. In particular they felt that the program responded well to requests for language arts methods but failed to address the needs in teaching other content areas. The following excerpt illustrates that perspective:

Felipe: I made a little diagram of different types of programs . . . Everyone, the preservice teachers and the university and the cooperating teacher would kind of get together and figure how to, what to do next. Does that seem like the way it worked?

Molly: That's the way I thought it was going to work and that's the way I would have liked to have seen it work, but I don't think it worked that way. I think it did with the reading, with the reading I think it went beautifully. I think that was our best unit, if you want to call it that and I wish every other topic had gone that way but I don't think it did happen.

Felipe: So you thought some of the methods were missing . . .

Molly: Oh I thought the methods were almost non-existent. (Interview, M3)

How the Personal Narrative Interacted with a Progressive Agenda

Contradictory responses provided the initial clue that led to an examination of the personal narrative and pedagogical positionality of the participants. The findings suggested that who the person was biographically impacted the way in which teacher education pedagogy was utilized in future practice. Interestingly the persons that had the most critical things to say about the program also had aspects of difficulty in reconciling the program philosophy with contextual classroom realities. In other words, the practices proposed by the program did not fully integrate with the realities of their past and present classrooms. Participants who were critical often expressed that they attempted incorporating program pedagogy and instructional strategies but found them lacking for the setting and population with which they were working.

Participants that meshed their current practice with the program pedagogical direction often stated that particular aspects of the program coincided with who they already were personality wise. In an attempt to explore why certain participants were employing program pedagogy while others were somewhat resistant, I began asking if certain practices they employed were learned or more a part of their personality. From this inquiry I received a variety of responses. Most of the responses indicated that who the person was played a major role in their willingness to employ or discard program pedagogy. Essentially, if a particular practice integrated with a personality tendency, it was employed. If a practice was in conflict with a person's intuitive inclinations, then the practice was discounted. The following interview excerpt illustrates how the personal narrative of one program graduate influenced her decision to attempt a progressive pedagogy, while others had found it more difficult.

Raquel: The fact that I had the Montessori background, which is definitely a hands-on way of learning . . . letting the students discover on their own . . . once again "teacher as coach" . . . that's the whole Montessori philosophy. That's what a directress is . . . You are just there to facilitate their learning. And so, [the] R: Tijeras's philosophy said exactly what [was] mine. Even though you don't call it Re: Learning principles it's basically Montessori philosophy I believe . . . so anyway as I was saying, I think it all really helped me, the students really responded to that . . . some of them weren't so good at writing and some of them can't even read. So the fact that I allowed them to build their volumes for their dinosaurs as well as make dinosaurs as well make a timeline. That's

how we incorporated history . . . I mean that was something that they were good at. (Interview, R5b-6t-9m)

Personal narratives also played into other aspects of the teaching experience. The personal narrative construct emerged in several circumstances in unrelated interview questions and responses. The following examples illustrate how one's cultural and life experiences play a part in how a beginning teacher employs the personal narrative in assuming the varied duties required by the teaching profession.

Excerpt # 1

Felipe: Another thing . . . was students that refused to learn . . . That conversation intensified in a couple of different forms . . . in the seminar . . . people again took different positions . . . some people thought that you had a responsibility. . . everybody can learn type of thing and other people [felt] some people will never learn and the heck with them . . . has your opinion changed since then?

Elaine: No. I will try my hardest. Because . . . I don't believe a kid does not want to learn. I really don't believe . . . because I've had a kid [like that] . . . And I think sometimes the harder they hide it they really want to learn it . . . you can reach them in a different way . . . I've taught one tough kid this year who . . . I was [warned about] I hate being warned about this. I hate it. I hate it when a teacher is like that . . . I guess he wouldn't do anything, he wouldn't respond, he'd sit there . . . he would just shut down . . . Jean [teaching associate] and I have had absolutely no problem. Just no problem.

Felipe: Why do you think that is?

Elaine: Maybe because I had my own kids. Maybe it's easier for me . . . That's probably why God gave me Sutter [her son]. I know there's gotta be a reason for this since we've gone through all this . . . I diagnosed two of my kids. Went up through the ranks. Nobody else knew it. And this is what really fries me. One kid was bouncing off the walls . . . This year it's just a quiet one, he did absolutely nothing because he doesn't talk. He sits there . . . And he's doing marvelous . . . he'll give me this look and he's got a real weird sense of humor and he'll give me this funny look and I kind [of] giggle at it .

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Choice, Listening to the Student Voice

There was an indicative pattern of democratic "choice" woven within the shift in paradigm. After several interviews I began to question whether the modeled "choice" driven pedagogy was actually implemented by the program graduates. Were the program graduates offering "choice" to their own students? I began asking versions of the following question: Are you letting the students have a voice in their own learning? The answer was usually affirmative, followed by specific but diverse qualifying examples. It became clear that people interpreted "choice" in different ways. How the individual participants went about interpreting democratic "choice" was dependent again on their personal narrative. The following interview excerpts illustrates a program graduate who was comfortable with the way the program modeled the concept of "choice" and sees "choice" as a needed pedagogical option in schools.

> Felipe: I'm saying . . . that R: Tijeras was a different kind of program . . . that they were shifting control . . . They let the learner have control over their own learning. For instance, you as a student . . . actually had a say in what you were learning. Is that true?
>
> Sandra: Yeah, . . . if we felt we weren't learning something that should be covered. We would say something about [it] and they would bring in speakers and they would bring in a special workshop on that. So they would have . . . sort of a general outline of things they needed to cover, I think. But, then in the framework, we had particular interests like when we . . . really spent a long time . . . on the whole reading program because we felt like we needed to . . . that's really what interested us. (Interview, so-1)
>
> Felipe: Now when you talk about restructuring do you have any way that you see that schools can be restructured? Is there any way that might work to restructure schools? Do you have some ideas on what you could get in there to push the system a little?
>
> Sandra: I think first and foremost just giving people actual choices. You know the older you get the more choices you should have. I think it might [be] overwhelming for the younger children, but to have choices in what you want to learn and how you want to go about it and how you want to show that you know what you're doing that you learned it, I think would be important. Instead of everyone doing the same thing and feeling forced and you're not really into this . . . I have much to say on that. I like the Re: Learning ways at least because I've been thinking about that a lot . . . and a lot [about] the

Montessori ideas . . . I'm thinking about the philosophy first because it's true. (Interview, SO-5)

Behavior Management and Choice

While exploring aspects of "choice" a theoretical pattern began to emerge. I noticed that there was a link between success in behavior management and the amount of "choice" offered in a learning context. A high level of comfort and teacher confidence seemed present in the classrooms that offered "choices" and numerous interactive learning experiences. I eventually began specifically asking if the program graduates felt a connection between their offering a learner centered curriculum and behavior management. Interestingly enough, the program graduates with high levels of "choice" driven curriculums did not see behavior management as a problem. Former program participants that chose to rely on more traditional pedagogical practices employed a higher reliance on specific behavior management strategies. In the next excerpt Raquel responded to a question regarding taking time with a troubled student. Her response addressed the connection between learner-centered education and behavior management. Raquel continued later in the interview to elaborate on why working class students do well in progressive educational settings.

Felipe: I'm going to play the devil's advocate . . . what about the kids that are really there to learn? When you are wasting all this time on this one particular guy that's disrupting the system and going to drop out anyway.

Raquel: First of all I think you need to always keep in mind that you want to be "teacher as coach." If you're coach, your students are going to be basically leading their own learning anyway. So if you have your classroom set up in a way that the students are the ones that are pursuing what they want to learn and how fast they want to learn and how far they want to go. I think that does free up a teacher to work more with these other students who need that. See what I am saying? The lecture type class where you stand up in the front and you lecture and you have your students taking notes. Then you're right. If you have a student that you have to keep stopping to go and discipline all the time, yes you are going to take away from your students, but if you've got your classroom set up in a way where it's working and it's running itself . . . and that's what I try to do because I had all these centers and the students would come, they would know that if they were working on the research paper they would get the books.

Felipe: Would you say that if you were to impose . . . a curriculum on this population that you are talking about [working class] . . . would you say that they would do better in that kind of environment [open, progressive] versus a strict environment?

Raquel: I think so because these are already students who are kind of rebellious type personalities and when you try to be too traditional with them and try to tell them . . . it has to be done exactly this way, I think you lose them. So I do think that although it was a little bit hard to get them to work on task in their cooperative learning groups, I think ultimately they ended up learning a lot and it was apparent from just their comments, their questions you know to me, I mean I really felt, I felt successful . . . I had been there about a week or two and one of the gang members came up and said, Miss Romero, I've learned more since you've [been] here in that week than I've learned the whole time, all year. (Interviews, R11-12)

Juxtaposed against this view of progressive approaches are voices that find learner centered education inapplicable to their particular context. In the following interview excerpt Molly expressed why she had to limit her use of a progressive approach in a working class setting. The strength of her traditional positionality suggested an entrenched personal philosophical stance. This indicates an influencing factor in determining one's selection of pedagogy.

Felipe: Hmmm . . . are there any choice type of things . . . I know choice is a big thing at the R: Tijeras program . . . you hear that word turn up everywhere in the seminar transcripts - "choice?"

Molly: Well, there are little choices but not a whole lot of choices. It's very structured.

Felipe: So you say they wanted structure. You can sense that they wanted it.

Molly: Yeah, I mean to the point that they would ask for it. They would say they enjoy doing that stuff. If you give them the freedom to do something in class, they will sit around, they will talk and they won't try anything and at the end of the period, they don't do the work.

Felipe: So how do they work with structure? What happened when you [gave] them the structured stuff?

Molly: They work individually at the desk.

Felipe: And they cooperate with that?

Molly: Yeah, they will do that. (Interview, m-2)

Dialectic Tension

It became apparent that preservice teachers were aware of a paradigmatic shift in their educational experience. Participants for the most part incorporated some portion of the pedagogy that had been modeled in the program. How they integrated the program pedagogy into their own practice was largely dependent on their personal narrative, philosophical positionality, and teaching ability. The context into which they were eventually employed also played a significant part. For example, two participants who both taught in working class schools employed diametrically opposed pedagogical strategies toward their students, despite the focal teacher education program having modeled the inclusion of student voice as a participatory influence in the preservice learning process. In dialectic terms the process was: (a) thesis-sharing control with students, (b) antithesis-tensions resulting from negotiating control, and (c) synthesis-blending personal narratives and the social context with the pragmatic learning experience. The following statement was excerpted from post interview comments written by a program graduate. The tension created through her participation in a shift away from the dominant pedagogical paradigm is explained.

From-Re: Interview questions for Felipe G.

As I explained on the tape I felt that there was a big shift in the way we were taught and in the philosophy that motivated it. I feel that the university normally treats adults as if they were children. They charge huge fees, but do not believe that this maybe because the universities know that often they do not teach what we need to know and that in fact we are paying for our degree in the belief that it will get us a job.

At R: Tijeras they expected us to be participants in the learning process. We were trusted to learn what was in front of us and valued as an important source of information as to what areas needed further study and in what form. . . .

> The huge shift was not always comfortable. I was used to being told exactly what was expected of me and how I could show the instructor that I "got It [sic}." That wasn't as true at R: Tijeras. We did it (in the classroom) [sic] and often no one but the children were there so how did anyone know if we were doing it? That was the discomfort. I was used to being told if I was doing what was wanted, and to have that much control was frightening (but very, very good in the long run) [sic]. It was more like being a first year teacher, but with tremendous back up and the ability to call for clarification at any time. (Post interview written comments, 1)

University and Context As Vital Components

A link between the culture of the university and the school culture is needed to create a successful bridge between theory and practice. The resident clinical supervisor in the collaborative site-based model was critical to the formulation of this linkage. Without the university, as theoretical component, the system balance would have skewed toward a program driven by practice and socializing influences. The R: Tijeras context had several advantages which influenced program success and acceptance. Whereas in most preservice teacher education programs the theoretically driven methods and socializing practice are distant from one another; in this program they were melded together by a common philosophy and context. The school itself had been working at restructuring itself, guided by a Re: Learning philosophy, based on Sizer's (1984) nine common principals. In addition, the university component was an active proponent of this philosophy's learner centered approach. The result was a context which favored the promotion of the program's philosophical directionality. The philsophical bridging of the university and school context represents a blending of theory and practice. Such unifying efforts, however, will always be under assault from the entrenched traditionalist from both contexts.

Issues of Equity

Communication Code Differences

The connection between the R: Tijeras program and working class schools can be explored by linking communication with culture. In the focal program there was a breakthrough in power relations communication. Communication code differences were reduced through a movement toward interactive educational experiences. Communication code differences often exist between the conflicting "created cultures" of working class students and their teachers who try to enlighten them through a dominant culture's curriculum. These communication code differences often unfold into acts of resistant behavior (McDermott, 1972). Under such conditions, the primary focus becomes subduing the students leading to further cultural conflict. Raquel, in her working class schooling context, stated that she entered the room with her "tattoo"

and "was them." Raquel's aligned personal narrative served to reduce the communication code differences. She ran a learner-centered program and further reduced incidences of negative resistance behaviors. While veteran teachers wrote six referrals a day, she wrote four in a semester. Raquel had established a level of "immediacy" (Mehrabian, 1969) with her students. She had limited problems with behavior management in a working class community which stereotypically should be awash in discipline problems. Her simple analysis of a veteran teacher's discipline problems fit quite well with instructional immediacy theory. She stated, "He didn't respect the students and the students didn't respect him." (Interview, r, 9)

In immediacy research regarding resistance/compliance behaviors it was found that teachers exhibiting immediate teaching strategies were less likely to elicit negative resistance behaviors (Burroughs, Kearney, & Plax, 1989). I use the word "negative" because resistance is not always negative. In the case of the students resisting the teacher who does not respect them, they are sending him a message regarding his pedagogical approach. Likewise, compliance is not necessarily positive.

I theorize an "immediate" curriculum brings the learner with a conflicting "created culture", closer to his/her learning process. Preservice teachers with a predisposed personal narrative tend to employ an immediate learner-centered curriculum as a result of a modeled, learner centered teacher education experience. Program graduates with more traditionally-oriented narratives made adaptations in learner-centered pedagogies. Inclinations to negate the pragmatic approach seemed primarily linked to preexisting beliefs. Still it seemed that there was a visible connection between the ease of employing "immediate" teaching strategies and the economic class level of the context. Program graduates in upper class schools found it much easier to implement a learner-centered program. Teachers of working class students usually "backed off" from the pragmatic approach, at least for a while.

Paulo Freire (1970) states, in clarification, that the oppressed are always co-dependents in their own oppression. In my examination of site-based programs there were numerous references to a difficulty in dealing with discipline in working class schools. I propose that this is due to a lack of "immediate" curriculum and instructional practices. The unfortunate fact is that immediate pedagogies are rarely tried in working class schools. When initially attempted they often fail and teachers revert to traditional teaching models which inevitably elicit greater cultural conflict. Students are then seen as not academically inclined.

Multicultural Education and the Role of the Facilitator

Almost without solicitation the issue of a lack of multicultural education methods emerged. Many of the program graduates found employment in situations where they needed cross-cultural teaching strategies. Though I feel that choice driven, learner-centered curriculum is

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the strongest current choice for reconstructive social movement; I also contend that issues of diversity and polarized division based on ethnicity are increasingly emerging in all schooling contexts. We live in a society that assigns value to ethnicity. People in working class situations have different ways of establishing communication connections. The following excerpt expresses how one program graduate perceived a need for multicultural methods.

> Carol: I had a group of Hispanic boys who are very strongly bonded and they used it many times in really negative interactions . . .
>
> Felipe: So they were forming their own kind of culture?
>
> Carol: Yeah they have their peer culture and it's all very related, very strong family bonds, you know. Which transferred to their peer relationships and when I could get them going in a positive use of peer culture and that bonding in a positive way, I could get some excellent work out of them but it seems like out on the playground and other times . . . they could really use it in a really, really negative way. And I really felt very strongly that a lot of that was because I didn't understand their culture and how their culture works . . . we had one lady come in and I know there's a lot of scheduling stuff but she spent one afternoon, I think maybe an hour on it and I think this is probably one of the strongest things we need to deal with is the fact that children from different cultures interact differently. They learn differently and this is a way to capitalize on that. If you . . . can really understand it. And I don't know about Hispanic culture . . . I think a lot of it just has to do with more experience you know in different cultures and I don't know if anybody else got into these problems but I know this is something that we talked about [that] really needed to be worked in more.
>
> Felipe: You felt there wasn't as much?
>
> Carol: I really feel that this is an area that really needs to go into more depth and the learning styles and strategies for working with the different children from different cultures. Not just that you know some cultures celebrate Cinco de Mayo . . . not a history lesson but specifically dealing with how these children learn. Strategies for working with children from different cultures. (Interview, Cl, 10)

I conclude that the focal teacher education program did not have a predictable influence on issues of equity in working class schools. The effects of the R: Tijeras program in working

class schools was highly dependent on the personal narrative of program graduates. Graduates that attained employment in middle and upper class schools were more inclined to rapidly integrate their program training and limit their socialization influence. Equity transformation is an issue requiring an established approach toward a reduction in classroom cultural conflict. R: Tijeras program's did not have a formal commitment to affect equity in working class schools. Multicultural and social transformation methods were not a primary concern of the program philosophy. Affecting educational equity was only achieved to the extent permitted by contextual, societal, and personality constraints.

Discussion

Creating change in any established system is an extremely complex endeavor. Schools are highly complicated places, continuously in a state of adjustment, but habitually reverting back to a reproduction of their original form. The confrontation between the pragmatic paradigm and the traditional paradigm has historically repeated itself. The R: Tijeras program was very successful in providing program participants training and preparation for their first year of teaching. Program graduates were overwhelmingly satisfied with their teacher education, leaving the program confident and prepared for their first year of teaching.

In working class schools a willingness to employ progressive pedagogies was highly dependent on the personal narrative of the program graduate. In working class schools participant teachers were often willing to have their students actively involved in their own learning, but only superficially solicited student input into designing their own curriculum. Teacher graduates often used learner-centered strategies relying on their own or district-mandated curriculum choices. Some program graduates eventually minimized learner-centered approaches because of their resistant contextual settings. However, the program graduates are capable teachers and in any classroom a capable teacher is beneficial.

The purpose of this program was to have graduates move into a pragmatic learner-centered approach toward teaching. Several program graduates, however, mentioned a need for multicultural strategies. Many program graduates mentioned the strength of the reading methods. The way in which language arts methods was constructed served as a model for other content areas. Having seen such strategies work at R: Tijeras, participants were more likely to employ learner-centered approaches in confrontational settings. One must acknowledge that the prospect of possibility for transformative change seems very likely. The graduate's confidence level and willingness to experiment with a non-traditional pedagogy must be considered as a favorable attribute toward future possibilities for all students.

During the research and after the analysis process, it became clear that the program had successfully prepared preservice teachers to enter the teaching profession. After several

interviews with the R: Tijeras program graduates and the graduates of other site-based programs, it was determined that a site-based presence in the schooling culture was a key element responsible for program success. All involved participants commented on the value of having the opportunity to immediately apply methods and to question their support system about their practice experiences. Being in the school context for the entire year was consistently elevated as an essential positive program attribute. I conclude that the bridging of theory and practice could not have taken place in a simulated classroom environment. In the R: Tijeras program the methods and the practicum experiences functioned as one interactive component.

Program Philosophy, A Common Language

The pragmatic Sizer (1992, pp. 225-227) Nine Common Principles served as a vehicle for creating a common language and a united set of philosophical goals. If an individual disagreed with these philosophical tenets, there remained an ideology in which to base disagreement other than the amorphous positionality of many teacher education programs. It was clear that the philosophy was learner-centered, site-based, and process driven. Maxims permeated program discussions, writings and eventual post program interviews: "Student as worker," "habits of mind," "choice," "less is more," and "teacher as coach." The unique quality of the university and the practicum context being linked philosophically gave the program strength in maintaining and transmitting its pedagogical beliefs. This united pedagogical positionality was not lost on the preservice teachers, but rather gave them a solid philosophical grounding with which to enter the classroom

Context and Personal Narrative

The focal teacher education context was also unusually abundant with supportive personalities. The university and cooperating teacher components, specifically the site-based clinical supervisor, were consistently acknowledged as supporting individuals. The Re: Learning aphorism "teacher as coach" was actively represented within the program's interacting population. The preservice teachers brought extensive personal narratives and previously constructed philosophical bases. The "student as worker" rather than "teacher as deliverer of instructional services" maxim was often in dichotomous opposition to these narrative tendencies. Consequently, if a program graduate was predisposed to a progressive educational agenda it became more evident in their classroom practice. If they had preferential ideological leanings toward a traditional practice model, they still incorporated some aspects of their teacher training but it was adapted to a perceived personal and contextual need.

The issue of non-existent methods emerged as a prominent program criticism. The program's approach to reading methods was lauded as a model methods experience by program

graduates with assorted narrative and philosophical inclinations. This methodological approach for delivering methods instruction, in a site-based context, was created and simultaneously field-tested in response to preservice and cooperating teacher demands. The reading methods were then developed through an interactive process that melded the program components into a collaborative effort toward facilitating preservice teacher acquisition of reading methodology. Cooperating teachers provided the practical curriculum, university personnel a theoretical perspective, and preservice teachers the inquiry directionality.

I conclude that the focal program did move toward the democratization of the generalized classroom. The vital element is the involvement of the learner in determining his/her own learning process. By engaging in such learner-centered practice I contend that the program questions the controlling influence of the dominant culture of schooling and takes an active step toward confronting social inequalities that permeate schools and our entire social system. Embedded cultural beliefs still support the benefits of the traditional educational paradigm. Throughout, the program participants often clung to the familiarity of a dictated curriculum. Movement toward having voice in one's own learning shakes at the foundation of what we all view as school, inducing uncertainty and tension.

Researcher Positionality, A Reflexive Exercise

My concern is for any student who silently or with active resistance fails in school. I have watched failure envelop haunting confused faces that can't understand why. The preservice teacher seminars were awash in questions with what to do with children "who refuse to learn." The issue and its answer sadly extends beyond the school walls. When we let students have a say in their own learning the frightening outside begins to trickle in, with all its beauty and the ugliness. While a controlling curriculum can keep some of the ugliness out, it also limits the beauty and diversity of our world.

There are no easy answers. As much as we want school to be a dichotomous issue of right or wrong, it is instead a mass of grays, fractals of endless continuums. What becomes clear is that there are numerous persons not benefiting from a very expensive educational system, expensive not so much in a monetary sense, but rather in a waste of human potential. A waste of teaching professionals exasperated and exhausted in front of once hopeful faces. A waste of hopeful faces that eventually harden and walk away from possibility. We cannot let it happen, and we do not have to, but the alternative is a "long revolution."

The pragmatic approach has come and gone many times since Dewey (1938). Neopragmatists engage in a new confrontation recalling that 20 years earlier hope was floundering in open classrooms. In essence, the confrontation is still at the same paradigmatic line. Somehow, though, the stakes seem a little higher, as prison populations push past the

million mark and the disparity between rich and poor becomes a chasm that education must bridge. The pragmatic approach embraced by many reform-minded educators contains the instructional strategies for movement toward schooling equity. Presevice teachers who experience such a learner centered, pragmatic approach are more capable of engaging in the next transformative step toward educational equity.

My researcher positionality moves along a theoretical continuum. Knowing how difficult changes are to sustain in schools, I label myself a "critical pragmatist." I now realize that to share control is itself a radical concept. I have come to believe that sharing control and affecting social conditions are intertwined pieces of the same solution. Habitually in search of solutions, I understand that there is not a single treatment for most social conditions. I research trying to capture the informing variables of chaos and order as they move through the corridors of what we call school.

It became clear to me early in my college career that I was most effected by any information that had to do with the social condition. Within that large category, I found that I had a special affinity with those with whom I shared ethnic roots. I remember viewing a film as an undergraduate on migrant laborers and leaving the large lecture hall in a state of rage and sadness. I knew it was about my parents, aunts, uncles, and cousins, and through some miracle it had become my distant reality. No comfort exists in this distance; it still haunts me and forces a constant examination of my sociocultural positioning. In this examination I realized that inequity is an issue that concerns all people across cultural and ethnic lines. I began this research by searching for a negative aspect regarding cultural dominance in the program. As the project progressed I realized that the program was doing an exquisite job of training teachers, but was not actively focused on the schooling conditions of working class children. I now understand that the pragmatic paradigm is a strategic stronghold from which to confront issues of social equity.

Future Research

Through out this research project, I found it necessary to limit my pursuit of many emerging topics. I feel that there is further investigation that must be done regarding why a person came to teaching and why they position themselves as they do in relation to their pedagogy. The following excerpt represents a sample of the possibilities for such inquiry. In this excerpt Judy explains why she chose the teaching profession.

Post program interviews.

Felipe: What led you to become a teacher?

> Judy: When I was little, I always played school even when I was very small. I was always the teacher and I taught other kids how to do something. Instead of playing house, we played school . . . I have a little brother that's fifteen years younger than me. He's in fifth grade right and when he was little, I sat there for hours teaching him how to drink out of straws. I just taught him all kinds of neat things. I always enjoyed teaching him different things. Being from Cuba, New Mexico, seeing the teachers up there, I wasn't real happy with the education that I got from some of my high school teachers and the education that my brother's getting from the elementary school teachers. And it wasn't that they were bad teachers; most of it was the politics and the administration of a small town. So I decided that I wanted to go into teaching and to make a difference. (Interview, J-10)

I would like to reinterview the program graduates in five years to see the impact of participation in a learner-centered, site based program on the professional longevity of its graduates. I would be especially interested in the impact that those concerned with multicultural issues had on their teaching contexts, as well as those with traditional positionality. How the development of graduates' philosophical positionality takes place over time is an unanswered longitudinal question. An aspect of future applied research would be to make some adjustments in the original program structure. I would like to formally include the community in the teacher training process. Secondly, I would like to locate the program in a working class area to see the effect of similar strategies in a socially challenged context. Next, I would like to initiate multicultural methods instruction applying the pragmatic approach used in developing the reading methods. Finally, I would like to assemble a consortium of university personnel, school based faculty, and preservice teachers who are focused on issues of social equity in schools. I contend that through a focused transformative effort, a collaborative school community consisting of theorists, teachers, preservice teachers, administrators, parents and children, can impact socially subordinating conditions.

Researching this program has taught me that a shared learning experience built on trust can shape the skills and ideas of future teachers. I have learned that school teachers will work very well with university faculty when respected in a shared collaborative effort. I understand that students will surpass your greatest expectations when you allow them to incorporate their own knowledge base into their education. The R: Tijeras program provides a vision of future possibilities. I experienced the complexity of making changes in what I once considered an impenetrable social structure.

References

Acheson, K. & Gall, M. (1987). *Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers.* New York: Longman.

Anyon, J. (1981). Social class and school knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry, 11* (1), 3-42.

Apple, M. W.. (1980). Analyzing determinations: understanding and evaluating the production of social outcomes in school. *Curriculum Inquiry, 10* (1), 55-76.

Apple, M. W., & Carspecken, P. F. (1992). Critical qualitative research: Theory, methodology, and practice. In M. D. LeCompte, W. L. Millroy, & J. Preissle (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research in Education* (pp. 507-553). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Berliner, D. C. (1988). Implications of studies on expertise in pedagogy for teacher education and evaluation. In *New directions for teacher assessment.* Princeton, MA: Educational Testing Service.

Bullough, R. V., Gitlin, A. D., & Goldstein, S. L. (1984). Ideology, teacher role, and resistance. *Teachers College Record, 86* (2), 339-358.

Bullough, R. V., Knowles, J. G., & Crow, N. A. (1989). Teacher self-concept and student culture in the first year of teaching. *Teachers College Record, 91* (2), 207-233.

Britzman, D. P. (1991). *Practice makes practice. A critical study of learning to teach.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Burroughs, N. F., Kearney, P., & Plax, T. G. (1989). Compliance-resistance in the college classroom. *Communication Education, 38,* 214-229.

Clarridge, P. M. & Berliner, D. C. (1991). Perceptions of student behavior a function of expertise. *Journal of Classroom Interaction. 26* (1), 1-8.

Crisci, P. E., March, J. K., & Peters, K. H. (1992). *Using the current paradigm in teacher training to prepare principals and mentor teachers to appraise classroom instruction.* Paper presented as the Annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, Atlanta, GA.

Cuban, L. (1984). *How teachers taught. Constancy and change in American classrooms 1890-1980.* New York: Longman.

Dewey J. (1938) *Experience and education.* (6th ed.) New York: Macmillan.

Eisenhart, M., Behm, L., & Romagnano, L. (1991). Learning to teach: Developing expertise or rite of passage. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 17,* 51-71.

Eisner, E. W. (1977). On the uses of connoisseurship and criticism for evaluating classroom life. *Teachers College Record, 78,* 345-358.

Eisner. E. W. (1979). *The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school programs.* New York: Macmillan.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). New York: Seabury.

Fuller, F. F. , & Bown, O. H. (1975). *Becoming a teacher.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gatto, J. T. (1992). *Dumming us down. The hidden curriculum of compulsory schooling.* Philadelphia: New Society Publishers.

Giroux, H. A. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals.* Massachusetts: Bergin and Garvey.

Golez, F. V. (1992). *Why Chicano children fail. Academic self-perceptions of Chicana/Chicano and Asian elementary school at lowered SES levels..* Unpublished Research Report.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks.* New York: International Publishers.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Heath, S. (1982). What no bedtime stroy means: Narrative skills as home and school. In *Language in Society.* (pp. 49-76). Cambridge University Press

Holt, J. (1964). *How Children Fail.* New York: Pittman Publishing Company.

Jackson, P. W. (1968). *Life in classrooms.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Kagan, D. M. (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research. 62* (2), 129-169.

Katz, M. B. (1987). *Reconstructing American education.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

LeCompte, M. D. & Preissle, J. (1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research.* San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Lundgren, L. P. (1972). *Frame factors and the teaching process: A contribution to curriculum theory and theory on teaching.* Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Lynch, J. (1989). *Multicultural education in a global society.* London: Falmer Press.

McDermott, R. (1974). Achieving school failure: An anthropological approach to illiteracy and social stratification. In *Education and cultural process: Toward an Anthropology of Education* edited by George D. Spindler. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

McNeil, L. (1988). *Contradictions of control. School structure and school knowledge.* New York: Routledge.

Mehrabian, A. (1969). Some referents and measures of non-verbal behavior. *Behavioral Research Methods and Instruments,* 1, 213-217.

Mehrabian, A. (1971). *Silent messages.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Mertz, N. T. & McNeely, S. R. (1992, April). *Pre-existing teaching constructs: How students "see" teaching prior to training.* Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Montessori, M. (1972). *Education and peace.* Chicago: Henry Regnery Company.

Neill, A. S. (1960). *Summerhill a radical approach to child rearing.* New York: Hart Publishing Company.

Nieto, S. (1992). *Affirming diversity. The sociopolitical context of multicultural education.* White Plains, NY: Longman.

Ogbu, J. (1983, June). Minority status and schooling in plural societies. *Comparative Education Review, 27* (2), 168-190.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods.* New bury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Rist, R. (1971). Student social class and teacher expectations: The self-fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education. *Challenging the Myths: The Schools, the Blacks, and the Poor,* Reprint Series # 5. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.

Schempp, P. G., Sparkes A. C., & Templin T. J. (1993). The micropolitics of teacher induction. *American Educational Research Journal, 30* (3), 447-472.

Schubert, W. H. (1986). *Curriculum: Perspective, paradigm and possibility.* New York: Macmillan.

Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science and human behavior.* New York: Macmillan.

Sizer, T. R. (1984). *Horace's compromise. The dilemma of the American high school.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Sizer, T. R. (1992). *Horace's school. Redesigning the American high school.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant observation.* Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Stanley, W. B. (1992). *Curriculum for utopia. Social reconstructionism and critical pedagogy in the postmodern era.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Strauss, A. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Su, J. Z. X. (1992). Sources of influence in preservice teacher socialization. *Journal of education for teaching. 18* (3), 239-258.

Thorndike, E. L. (1903). *Educational psychology.* New York: The Science Press.

White, Jane J. (1989). Student teaching as a rite of passage. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 20,* 177-195.

Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labor. How working class kids get working class jobs.* New York: Columbia University Press.